REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-13 and 16-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 10-12, 16, 17, 19, 21 and 22 are amended. Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the features recited in claims 3 and 4. Claim 12 is amended to incorporate the features recited in claims 14 and 15. Claim 6, 8, 17 and 19 are amended to be in independent form. Claims 5 and 16 are amended to depend from claims 1 and 12 respectively. Claims 10, 11, 21 and 22 are amended to correct informalities. No new matter is added. Claims 3, 4, 14 and 15 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter that each of these claims recites. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Allowable claims

The Office Action indicates on page 5, item 3 that claims 6-9 and 17-20 recite allowable features and would be allowed if written in independent form including all the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 6-9 and 17-20 recite allowable features, and amended claims 6, 8, 17 and 19 to be in independent form based on this indication. Accordingly claims 6-9 and 17-20 are in condition for allowance.

Rejections under 102(e)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 10-16, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0142749 to Hong. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, when the sum of the magnitudes of the motion vectors of the neighboring blocks is equal to `0`, setting the minimum value of the search range for the adaptive motion vector to a predetermined value, which is obtained by adding a predetermined constant to the value of the search range for the adaptive motion vector defined by a user, and then, dividing a resultant value of the search range for the adaptive motion vector by four. Claim 12 recites, among other features, the minimum value of the search range for the

adaptive motion vector is set to a predetermined value, the predetermined value being obtained by adding a predetermined constant to the value of the search range for the adaptive motion vector defined by the user, and then, dividing a resultant value of the search range for the adaptive motion vector by four, if the sum of the magnitudes of the motion vectors of the neighboring blocks is equal to zero.

The office action asserts that Hong teaches the above features at equation (2).

Hong teaches at equation (2) that when $\alpha_i \geq 2$, $k_i = (input\_search\_range + 2)/4$ but that when $\alpha_i < 2$ $k_i = (input\_search\_range + 2)/8$. Therefore, Hong does not teach when the sum of the magnitudes of the motion vectors of the neighboring blocks is equal to `0` dividing a resultant value of the search range for the adaptive motion vector by four, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 12, at least, because Hong teaches dividing by 8 when $\alpha_i < 2$.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Hong cannot reasonably be considered to teach the combinations of all of the features positively recited in claims 1 and 12. Further, Hong cannot reasonably be considered to teach, the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 2, 5, 10, 11, 13, 16, 21 and 22 for at least the dependence of these claims on allowable base claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 10-13, 16, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hong are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicants' attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: November 17, 2010
YSH/ML/jr